



**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL INTERIM COMMITTEE**  
**ON**  
**TRANSPORTATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT**

***FINAL REPORT***

**January 1996**

1995  
Legislative Council Interim Committee  
Transportation Resources Management

FINAL REPORT

The Committee on Transportation Resources Management was authorized in 1995 by House Concurrent Resolution No. 21 of the First Regular Session of the Fifty-third Idaho Legislature. The committee was directed to undertake and complete a study of the issues affecting comprehensive management of the transportation resources of this state and to report its findings and recommendations, including proposed legislation if any, to the Second Regular Session of the Fifty-third Idaho Legislature.

The committee of six senators and six representatives was chaired by Senator Evan Frasure of Pocatello and Representative JoAn Wood of Rigby. By the provisions of HCR 21, the committee also included four nonlegislative, nonvoting members representing the Idaho Transportation Department, the Idaho Association of Counties, the Association of Idaho Cities and the Idaho Association of Highway Districts. The committee held a total of thirteen meetings and public hearings: eight meetings were held in Boise on June 20 and 21, July 26, 27 and 28, October 18 and 19, and November 16, 1995; and five days of public hearings were conducted in the six transportation districts of the state on August 14 in District II at Lewiston and Moscow; August 15 in District I at Sandpoint and Coeur d'Alene; September 21 in District VI at Rigby and District V in Pocatello; September 22 in District IV at Burley; and October 17 in District III at Nampa.

The committee spent a major portion of its time accumulating pertinent information on the budget and operations of the Idaho Transportation Department and reviewing with the respective consultants the results of two major highway studies: the Idaho Highway Needs Assessment Study Update which rated the condition of Idaho's highways and estimated over four billion dollars are needed to remedy the deficiencies, and the Idaho Highway Cost Allocation Study which analyzed the tax structure and cost responsibilities for users of the system. Considerable time was also spent obtaining data on the management of roads and bridges under the jurisdiction of the two hundred eighty-three cities, counties and highway districts. In addition, the committee considered the role of other state agencies having responsibilities associated with use of public roadways, including the Department of Law Enforcement, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the State Tax Commission and the Public Utilities Commission.

The consensus of the committee was that preservation of the transportation infrastructure of the state is crucial to the health of Idaho's economy and that additional funding for highways is justified. Several factors contribute to the need for additional funding: inflation has eroded the buying power of revenues generated by the fuel tax and registration fees; increased fuel efficiencies have resulted in lower fuel requirements per vehicle thus reducing fuel tax revenues; and with more vehicles using the roads, the rate and amount of damage inflicted on the highways is accelerated.

The committee believes, however, that it is unrealistic to expect Idaho taxpayers to raise an additional \$6 billion in new taxes and fees as outlined in the Highway Needs Assessment Study Update. The majority of the committee believes the update study overstates the case. Rather, by careful prioritization of projects under jurisdiction of the Idaho transportation department and local highway jurisdictions, coupled with a modest

increase in fuel taxes and registration fees, the backlog of pavement deficiencies can be reduced over the next ten years from the current level of approximately forty percent to less than twenty percent.

If the state's transportation system is to be maintained and even expanded to meet the increasing demands being placed on it, considerable effort will have to be made simultaneously by the Legislature and all governmental entities with any responsibility for highways, roads and bridges. The committee's recommendations are therefore addressed to the Legislature, to the Idaho Transportation Department, and to the local highway jurisdictions.

### LEGISLATURE

The committee chose to deal with the primary issues as separate items rather than in combination as an integrated package. Individual recommendations include:

1. Increase the fuel tax by four cents per gallon beginning May 1, 1996.
2. Increase registration fees for vehicles under eight thousand pounds gross weight in categories by age of vehicle, reducing categories from the current five age groups to three age groups, beginning January 1, 1997:  
Vehicles one and two years old.....\$48.00 (from \$36.48)  
Vehicles three through six years old.....\$36.00 (from \$33.48/26.28)  
Vehicles seven years and older.....\$24.00 (from \$22.16/16.08)
3. Create a new dedicated fund into which all fuel tax and registration fee increases authorized by the 1996 legislature will be deposited. Fund shall be named "Restricted Highway, Bridge and Railroad Crossing Construction and Repair Fund."
4. Distribute moneys from the new fund equally between the transportation department and local highway jurisdictions.
5. Support the concept of a system of registration only for vehicles over eight thousand pounds which shall include elimination of the weight-distance tax on vehicles over sixty thousand pounds. The revised system should be revenue neutral within existing categories of taxation.
6. Adjust the fee for license plates to reflect the costs of production, administration and distribution. Request the transportation department to determine the cost to the state to produce, administer and distribute license plates for standard plates and for special issue plates, and report that information to the 1996 legislature.
7. Review the cost to the counties to administer the license plate program and consider statutory changes if indicated. Request each county to analyze its cost to administer and store license plates and report findings to the germane committees during the 1996 legislative session.
8. All proposed legislation shall be introduced in the House of Representatives.

### IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Before the committee will recommend any increase in funding for roads bridges, it must be certain existing available funds are being spent wisely and that the department is operating with maximum efficiency. The committee recommends that the Idaho transportation department and management should perform the following and report

progress and findings to the Governor and to the germane standing committees of the legislature.

1. Reduce staff by a minimum of 100 FTP over a three-year period primarily through attrition.
2. Justify the state aircraft operation.
3. The Idaho transportation board should review the road and bridge priorities set forth in the transportation department's five-year plan to ensure they are consistent with the more critical needs identified in the 1995 Highway Needs Assessment Study Update, except that highest priorities should be based on those projects that have the greatest payback to the state's economy and improved safety.
4. Perform future "needs studies" within the department rather than contracting with outside consultants.
5. Recommend statutory amendments for disposal of surplus property and rights-of-way.
6. The committee encourages the aggressive adoption of technology efficiencies that benefit the public and our Idaho businesses as well as the ITD. Examples of new technologies that should be further investigated are Electronic Fleet Registration (allowing businesses having larger fleets to register all vehicles at one time, except for individual purchases and sales) and motor carrier compliance checks at ports of entry (we applaud your testing this technology in one port of entry).
7. Advise the legislature regarding the following matters affecting the ports of entry and motor carrier assessments:
  - a. The merits, both pro and con, of ITD operating the ports of entry vs. the PUC (ports of entry is a regulatory function performed by ITD and administered by the ITD district engineer). The PUC already performs regulatory truck safety and insurance inspections for intrastate carriers, and the Federal Highway Department (FHD) performs comparable inspections for interstate carriers with the Idaho State Police (ISP) performing additional road inspections under contract with the FHD. On the surface, it appears significant efficiencies could be obtained for these functions were consolidated and both agencies focused on the things they do best. The ITD district engineer could focus on roads and bridges and the PUC could focus on regulatory matters.
  - b. Disclose the full cost of operating the ports of entry program in fiscal year 1995 versus the amount of revenue received from that program. What are the pros and cons of using roving ports of entry versus fixed facilities.
  - c. Advise the legislature as to the merits or effects, both pro and con, of the principal alternative methods of assessing motor carriers' fees and taxes considering the cost to state and local governments to construct and maintain roads capable of carrying heavy trucks, as well as the cost to government and the motor carriers for administering and complying with the method used.
  - d. The assessment should particularly address the weight-distance tax vs. the alternative method recommended by the Idaho Motor Transport Association and the alternative method ITD believes is most reasonable and practical from an equity and efficiency standpoint (efficient for both government and

business).

8. Review north-south commercial air service, especially between Coeur d'Alene and Boise.
9. Investigate the possibilities of a public-private partnership between the state, local governments, and railroad companies to improve safety at railroad crossings.
10. Consider funding methods that would allow ITD to participate in funding public transportation.

The following recommendations to improve efficiency of operations are suggestions *for evaluation of* certain functions of the department to determine whether or not such functions could be reengineered, downsized, privatized or eliminated. These recommendations, numbered 11. through 50., are based on an evaluation project already in progress by the department entitled "Activities Being Analyzed By The Idaho Transportation Department To Improve Efficiency".

#### Department-wide Management and Support

11. Privatize building and grounds maintenance.
12. Reengineer mail sorting and processing.
13. Downsize the human resource development function.
14. Reengineer or privatize the print shop.
15. Reengineer or eliminate the word processing service center.
16. Reengineer and downsize the accounting and financial management function through development and implementation of an integrated financial management system in a client/server environment.
17. Reengineer and downsize the information services and data processing functions through simplification of the information processing environment; adopt the client/server model for departmental computing systems and set departmental standards for data management, local and wide area networks, operating systems and office automation applications.
18. Reengineer the central files and records retention facility so that it collects, indexes and stores all of the official records of ITD.
19. Reengineer the processes for awarding and administering grants in the Division of Aeronautics, Division of Public Transportation and Office of Highway Safety for greater efficiency and more effective program administration.

#### Division of Highways

20. Downsize and privatize the project design function in the Division of Highways by channeling more of such work to private sector firms.
21. Reengineer the process of monitoring, assessment and achievement of project quality standards, quality assurance and quality control on highway construction projects and shift the responsibility for inspection, reporting and certification to contractors who perform the work.
22. Downsize and privatize highway maintenance functions of highway striping and right-of-way mowing by contracting a larger portion of such services to the private sector.
23. Downsize and privatize the tasks related to weed and vegetation control on state-

owned right-of-way by partnering with local agencies and contracting with private firms.

24. Privatize the installation of electrical lines and controllers for traffic signals on a greater number of projects.
25. Privatize a greater number of projects to install and maintain roadway signs.
26. Privatize some equipment repair and maintenance functions within the district and headquarters vehicle maintenance and service stations.
27. Privatize a greater portion of routine roadway maintenance tasks such as pothole patching, shoulder rehabilitation and guardrail repair.
28. Reexamine the economic costs of ownership versus leasing at expected utilization rates for heavy and specialized construction and maintenance equipment over the physical life cycle of such equipment.
29. Reexamine and reengineer the cross training and utilization of key maintenance and engineering staff for better year-round and seasonal utilization.
30. Privatize some materials laboratory functions.
31. Explore the feasibility of combining materials laboratory work in headquarters and district three with a view toward elimination of one or both laboratories.
32. Reexamine the inventory of owned equipment in each district to determine that each item is necessary and desirable; transfer or dispose of excess items using proceeds to reduce working capital requirements.
33. Review working relationships and respective project responsibilities with counties and local highway districts to determine optimal division of work and responsibilities; shift responsibilities for project duties to local entities wherever feasible.
34. Reengineer and downsize as appropriate the functions of both fixed and roving Ports of Entry by implementing more complete automated services for weigh-in-motion, automated vehicle identification systems, the issuance and administration of permits, citations and the collection and deposit of fees and taxes.
35. Eliminate the headquarters bridge inspection crew by privatizing function.
36. Privatize the federally sponsored Technology Transfer Center by transferring the function to a qualified participating educational institution.
37. Reengineer or privatize the collection and assessment of roadway profile data.
38. Privatize the collection of data with respect to falling weight deflection on roadway surfaces and skid testing.
39. Privatize the collection, processing and entry of data on highway accidents.
40. Privatize the appraisal and negotiation of right-of-way purchases and property management chores.

#### Division of Motor Vehicles

41. Privatize a larger portion of data entry for issuance of motor vehicle titles.
42. Reengineer and automate the preparation and transmission of driver licensing and traffic violation history reports to Idaho traffic and criminal courts.
43. Downsize and privatize the commercial motor carrier audits with respect to weight-distance tax assessment and collection.

#### Division of Planning

44. Downsize and privatize the function of traffic volume counting.

45. Downsize and privatize the collection of data for vehicle weigh-in-motion.
46. Downsize and privatize the installation, repair and maintenance of traffic sensing devices.
47. Reengineer and downsize data gathering with respect to roadway visual distress ratings, the video log project and the local road inventory.
48. Reengineer and downsize the headquarters planning function with respect to consolidation of rail and intermodal planning.

#### Division of Public Transportation

49. Privatize vehicle procurement for local public transportation agencies.
50. Privatize the administration of rural transit programs.

### LOCAL HIGHWAY JURISDICTIONS

Representatives for the 283 local highway jurisdictions were asked to take under advisement certain issues and report their findings in appropriate legislative form to the 1997 legislature. The aim of local highway entities should be to apply as many of their state-allocated dollars as possible to road and bridge needs. The committee noted that in many instances much of the state's money which is allocated through the highway distribution account to the local jurisdictions is used for functions other than road and bridge projects, such as administration and purchasing and repairing equipment and buildings. In addition, the effort made at the local level to augment state moneys varies considerably. It is recommended that representatives of local highway jurisdictions take under advisement the following issues:

1. State funds to be allocated on a matching basis.
2. State funds to be allocated to one county entity with further distributions to other highway jurisdictions within the county by decision of appointed local representatives.
3. Consolidation of jurisdictions into one highway entity per county. Include statutory changes relating to percentage of electors required to sign initiating petitions.
4. Additional encouragement of voter-approved local option vehicle registration fees or other "user-based" fees for specific highway and bridge needs.
5. Advancing the concept of regionalized planning for roads and bridges.
6. Utilizing private contracting to reduce need for extensive equipment and facility inventories.
7. Developing more specific rules for filling out the standardized form used to report comparative financial data.
8. Evaluating the cost benefits of appropriating \$250,000 annually to the Highway Technical Assistance Council.
9. Recommend what legislation, rules, or policy changes are required to ensure there is total communication, cooperation, and agreement between local land use planners and the Idaho transportation department on decisions that significantly impact state and interstate roads and bridges.

# ALL DISTRICTS

IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION

LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994  
IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1995

JURISDICTION		Population (thousands)	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION								FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions		
				Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other					
				\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%				
DISTRICT 1																												
Local Jurisdictions (46)		151	9.9	3.6	12%	24	9.7	33%	64	16.1	55%	107	29.5	195	2,587	NA	3.9	13%	14.5	50%	4.9	17%	5.8	20%	29.1	10.3		
ITD			NA												607	205	.6	2%	31.6	98%	.1	0%	.0	0%	32.3	NA		
TOTAL (5 COUNTIES)																												
DISTRICT 2																												
Local Jurisdictions (53)			13.2	4.4	21%	46	9.2	44%	96	7.5	35%	78	21.2	220	3,335	NA	1.7	8%	13.7	63%	3.9	18%	2.4	11%	21.7	12.7		
ITD			NA												700	187	.5	3%	15.6	96%	.1	0%	.0	0%	16.2	NA		
TOTAL (5 COUNTIES)		96																										
DISTRICT 3																												
Local Jurisdictions (49)			25.1	6.6	11%	15	25.5	43%	58	27.8	46%	64	60.0	137	5,647	NA	7.2	12%	34.7	58%	7.4	12%	10.6	18%	59.9	25.2		
ITD			NA												1,047	264	.7	1%	63.6	99%	.1	0%	.0	0%	64.4	NA		
TOTAL (10 COUNTIES)		437																										
DISTRICT 4																												
Local Jurisdictions (57)			8.7	.2	1%	1	13.7	58%	92	9.6	41%	64	23.5	157	5,037	NA	4.0	17%	13.3	58%	3.8	17%	1.7	7%	22.8	9.4		
ITD			NA												832	175	.6	2%	29.0	98%	.1	0%	.0	0%	29.7	NA		
TOTAL (8 COUNTIES)		150																										
DISTRICT 5																												
Local Jurisdictions (37)			5.9	.2	1%	1	12.2	63%	83	6.9	36%	47	19.3	131	3,961	NA	2.7	14%	10.9	56%	4.2	22%	1.8	9%	19.6	5.6		
ITD			NA												732	177	.9	5%	16.9	95%	.0	0%	.0	0%	17.8	NA		
TOTAL (7 COUNTIES)		147																										
DISTRICT 6																												
Local Jurisdictions (41)			8.2	.4	2%	3	12.8	69%	84	5.3	28%	34	18.5	121	4,126	NA	3.5	19%	10.6	57%	3.8	21%	.8	4%	18.7	8.0		
ITD			NA												1,053	172	.9	4%	19.6	96%	.0	0%	.0	0%	20.5	NA		
TOTAL (9 COUNTIES)		152																										
STATEWIDE TOTAL																												
Local Jurisdictions (283)			71.0	15.5	9%	14	83.2	48%	73	73.2	43%	65	171.9	152	24,692	NA	22.9	13%	97.9	57%	28.1	16%	23.0	13%	171.9	71.1		
Total ITD District Operations			NA												4,971	1,180	4.2	2%	176.4	97%	.3	0%	.0	0%	180.9	NA		
ITD Headquarter Road Related			NA													620	7.1	6%	92.2	82%	12.6	11%	.0	0%	111.9	NA		
Aeronautics & Public Transportation			NA													20	.5	7%	1.7	24%	.0	0%	4.9	69%	7.1	NA		
Total Idaho Transportation Department *			24.0	138.3	49%	122	138.0	49%	122	6.5	2%	6	282.8	250			11.8	4%	270.2	90%	12.9	4%	4.9	2%	299.9	7.0		
ALL JURISDICTIONS		1,133	95.0	153.9	34%	136	221.1	49%	195	79.7	18%	70	454.7	401	29,663	1,820	34.7	7%	368.1	78%	41.0	9%	27.9	6%	471.7	78.1		

\*Note: ITD beginning and ending fund balances do not include encumbrances. Fiscal year 1995 encumbrances are included in expenditures by classification. ITD had \$37.4 million in outstanding encumbrances at the end of FY 1995.

Improved Road Miles (IRM) means a graded and drained earth traveled way or better, to include one graded and graveled or with paved surface. The listed IRM for local jurisdictions does not include cities but is for county and highway districts only.



# DISTRICT 1

## IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

## SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION

## LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS

YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

JURISDICTION	Population	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION								FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions
			Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other			
			\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%		
CHATCOLET	73	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	97%	35	.0	3%	1	.0	36		.0	25%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	75%	.0	.0	
PLUMMER	793	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	88%	49	.0	12%	6	.0	55		.0	10%	.0	64%	.0	26%	.0	0%	.0	.0	
ST MARIES	2,669	.1	.0	0%	-	.2	60%	62	.1	40%	42	.3	104		.1	55%	.0	4%	.0	0%	.1	41%	.2	.2	
TENSED	91	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	35	.0	0%	-	.0	35		.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	100%	.0	.0	
BENEWAH COUNTY		.3	.1	7%	-	.5	69%		.2	24%		.7		253		.3	42%	.1	19%	.3	37%	.0	3%	.7	.3
PLUMMER GATEWAY HD		.0	.0	5%	-	.2	52%		.2	43%		.4		92		.1	26%	.1	28%	.0	6%	.2	41%	.4	.0
BENEWAH COUNTY	8,539	.4	.1	5%	9	.9	63%	111	.5	32%	56	1.5	176	346		.5	38%	.3	21%	.3	21%	.3	21%	1.4	.5
CLARK FORK	471	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	34%	34	.0	66%	65	.0	99		.0	4%	.0	9%	.0	11%	.0	77%	.0	.1	
DOVER	335	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	34%	33	.0	66%	64	.0	97		.0	0%	.0	100%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	.0	
EAST HOPE	231	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	28%	44	.0	72%	113	.0	157		.0	5%	.0	81%	.0	4%	.0	10%	.0	.0	
HOPE	116	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	52%	31	.0	48%	29	.0	60		.0	0%	.0	15%	.0	44%	.0	41%	.0	.0	
KOOTENAI	2,238	.1	.0	0%	-	.0	82%	13	.0	18%	3	.0	17		.0	0%	.0	90%	.0	0%	.0	10%	.0	.0	
OLD TOWN	166	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	25%	71	.0	75%	208	.0	279		.0	4%	.0	69%	.0	2%	.0	25%	.0	.0	
PONDERAY	491	.1	.0	0%	-	.0	23%	43	.1	77%	144	.1	187		.0	2%	.1	90%	.0	1%	.0	7%	.1	.0	
PRIEST RIVER	1,679	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	58%	68	.1	42%	49	.2	117		.0	14%	.0	31%	.0	30%	.0	25%	.2	.1	
SANDPOINT	5,725	.1	.0	0%	-	.2	75%	33	.1	25%	11	.2	44		.0	10%	.2	69%	.0	6%	.0	15%	.3	.1	
BONNER COUNTY		1.7	.6	16%	-	1.3	33%		2.0	51%		4.0		690		.4	12%	1.7	49%	.8	22%	.6	17%	3.4	2.3
SANDPOINT INDEP. HD¹		.1	.0	7%	-	.2	37%		.3	56%		.5		0		.0	7%	.4	70%	.1	20%	.0	2%	.6	.1
BONNER COUNTY	31,890	2.2	.7	13%	21	1.9	36%	60	2.7	51%	84	5.3	165	690		.5	11%	2.6	54%	1.0	20%	.7	16%	4.8	2.7
BONNERS FERRY	2,244	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	41%	34	.1	59%	50	.2	85		.0	10%	.1	75%	.0	10%	.0	4%	.2	.0	
MOYIE SPRINGS	435	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	74%	34	.0	26%	12	.0	46		.0	44%	.0	1%	.0	1%	.0	53%	.0	.0	
BOUNDARY COUNTY		1.6	.2	24%	-	.6	66%		.1	10%		.9		274		.0	3%	.7	50%	.5	35%	.2	12%	1.4	1.2
BOUNDARY COUNTY	9,189	1.7	.2	20%	25	.7	62%	78	.2	18%	23	1.2	126	274		.1	4%	.8	53%	.5	31%	.2	11%	1.6	1.3
ATHOL	409	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	31%	31	.0	69%	69	.0	100		.0	18%	.0	51%	.0	20%	.0	11%	.0	.0	
COEUR D'ALENE	26,611	.0	.0	0%	-	.9	11%	33	7.4	89%	279	8.3	313		.3	4%	5.1	63%	.4	5%	2.2	28%	8.1	.2	
DALTON GARDENS	2,170	.0	.0	0%	-	.2	78%	70	.0	22%	20	.2	90		.0	1%	.1	77%	.0	0%	.0	21%	.1	.1	
FERNAN LAKE	186	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	88%	77	.0	12%	11	.0	88		.0	9%	.0	51%	.0	0%	.0	40%	.0	.0	
HARRISON	232	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	26%	34	.0	74%	97	.0	131		.0	0%	.0	80%	.0	0%	.0	20%	.0	.0	
HAUSER	427	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	83%	32	.0	17%	6	.0	39		.0	0%	.0	94%	.0	6%	.0	0%	.0	.0	
HAYDEN	4,693	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	44%	30	.2	56%	38	.3	68		.0	8%	.2	48%	.1	18%	.1	25%	.3	.1	
HAYDEN LAKE	374	.1	.0	0%	-	.0	29%	33	.0	71%	82	.0	115		.0	45%	.0	0%	.0	4%	.0	50%	.0	.1	
HUETTER	85	.0	.0	38%	23	.0	56%	34	.0	5%	3	.0	61		.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	100%	.0	.0	
POST FALLS	8,494	.0	.0	0%	-	.3	39%	32	.4	61%	51	.7	83		.4	50%	.1	20%	.1	20%	.1	10%	.7	.0	
RATHDRUM	2,382	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	64%	34	.0	36%	19	.1	53		.1	66%	.0	5%	.0	13%	.0	16%	.1	.0	
SPIRIT LAKE	883	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	70%	33	.0	30%	14	.0	46		.0	9%	.0	39%	.0	36%	.0	16%	.1	.0	
WORLEY	194	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	47%	34	.0	53%	38	.0	72		.0	1%	.0	70%	.0	0%	.0	29%	.0	.0	
EASTSIDE HD		.1	.0	0%	-	.8	62%		.5	38%		1.3		230		.4	28%	.5	41%	.2	14%	.2	18%	1.3	.1
LAKES HD		.8	.2	6%	-	1.1	34%		1.9	60%		3.2		263		.5	20%	1.2	46%	.5	20%	.4	14%	2.6	1.4
POST FALLS HD		1.4	.1	5%	-	.8	42%		1.1	53%		2.0		210		.3	17%	.8	38%	.5	24%	.4	21%	2.0	1.4
WORLEY HD		.6	.1	8%	-	.5	40%		.7	52%		1.3		182		.2	17%	.6	51%	.4	31%	.0	0%	1.2	.7
KOOTENAI COUNTY	87,277	3.2	.4	2%	5	4.9	28%	56	12.4	70%	142	17.7	203	885		2.3	13%	8.7	52%	2.2	13%	3.5	21%	16.7	4.2
KELLOGG	2,495	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	42%	38	.1	58%	52	.2	90		.1	27%	.1	48%	.0	15%	.0	11%	.2	.1	
MULLAN	815	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	40%	36	.0	60%	53	.1	89		.0	55%	.0	23%	.0	3%	.0	19%	.1	.0	
OSBURN	1,507	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	84%	72	.0	16%	14	.1	85		.0	31%	.1	51%	.0	5%	.0	12%	.1	.0	
PINEHURST	1,784	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	83%	34	.0	17%	7	.1	41		.0	40%	.0	31%	.0	2%	.0	27%	.1	.0	
SMELTERVILLE	453	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	36	.0	0%	-	.0	36		.0	0%	.0	37%	.0	4%	.0	58%	.0	.0	
WALLACE	994	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	46%	50	.1	54%	60	.1	110		.0	37%	.0	10%	.0	15%	.0	37%	.1	.0	
WARDNER	247	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	45%	76	.0	55%	92	.0	169		.0	5%	.0	23%	.0	6%	.0	66%	.0	.0	
SHOSHONE COUNTY		2.2	2.2	72%	-	.8	26%		.1	2%		3.0		379		.3	7%	1.8	46%	.9	24%	.9	23%	3.8	1.4
CLARKIA BETTER RD HD		.0	.1	55%	-	.1	42%		.0	4%		.1		13		.0	34%	.1	38%	.0	6%	.0	23%	.1	.0
SHOSHONE COUNTY	13,871	2.4	2.3	59%	163	1.2	32%	88	.4	9%	26	3.8	277	393		.5	11%	2.1	44%	1.0	22%	1.1	23%	4.6	1.6
CITIES (35)	73,192	1.0	.0	0%	0	2.7	23%	37	9.1	77%	124	11.8	162	0		1.2	11%	6.5	57%	.8	7%	2.9	25%	11.5	1.3
COUNTIES (4)	-	5.9	3.1	36%	-	3.2	37%	-	2.4	27%	-	8.7	-	1,596		1.0	11%	4.3	46%	2.4	26%	1.7	18%	9.3	5.3
HIGHWAY DISTRICTS (7)	-	3.1	.5	6%	-	3.7	42%	-	4.6	52%	-	8.9	-	991		1.6	20%	3.7	45%	1.7	21%	1.2	15%	8.3	3.7
DISTRICT 1 TOTAL (46)	150,766	9.9	3.6	12%	24	9.7	33%	64	16.1	55%	107	29.5	195	2,587		3.9	13%	14.5	50%	4.9	17%	5.8	20%	29.1	10.3

<sup>1</sup> The Sandpoint Independent Highway District has no improved road miles outside the city limits of Sandpoint.

# DISTRICT 2

## IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

## SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION

LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

JURISDICTION	Population	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION								FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions		
			Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other					
			\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%				
ELK RIVER	153	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	55%	116	.0	45%	95	.0	212		.0	24%	.0	42%	.0	22%	.0	12%	.0		.0	.0	
ORO FINO	3,010	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	56%	46	.1	44%	36	.2	82		.0	10%	.2	79%	.0	0%	.0	11%	.3		.1	.0	
PIERCE	755	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	45%	35	.0	55%	43	.1	78		.0	10%	.0	55%	.0	12%	.0	24%	.0		.0	.0	
WEIPPE	523	.2	.0	0%	-	.0	73%	67	.0	27%	25	.0	93		.0	45%	.0	4%	.0	33%	.0	19%	.0		.2	.0	
CLEARWATER COUNTY		.5	.5	50%	-	.5	48%		.0	2%		.9		213		.0	4%	.6	53%	.3	30%	.1	13%	1.1		.4	.0
CLEARWATER HD		.3	.2	44%	-	.2	49%		.0	7%		.5		110		.2	38%	.2	42%	.0	0%	.1	21%	.5		.3	.0
CLEARWATER COUNTY	9,061	1.1	.7	38%	76	.9	50%	100	.2	12%	25	1.8	200	323		.3	14%	1.0	53%	.3	18%	.3	15%	2.0		.9	.0
COTTONWOOD	852	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	28%	36	.1	72%	92	.1	128		.0	0%	.1	76%	.0	11%	.0	12%	.1		.0	.0	
FERNAND	141	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	43%	58	.0	57%	77	.0	135		.0	0%	.0	87%	.0	0%	.0	13%	.0		.0	.0	
GRANGEVILLE	3,208	.2	.0	0%	-	.1	39%	35	.2	61%	55	.3	91		.0	9%	.2	52%	.0	8%	.1	30%	.4		.1	.0	
KOOSKIA	708	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	58%	34	.0	42%	24	.0	59		.0	42%	.0	16%	.0	7%	.0	35%	.0		.0	.0	
RIGGIS	460	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	74%	34	.0	26%	12	.0	46		.0	25%	.0	51%	.0	0%	.0	24%	.0		.0	.0	
STITES	215	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	90%	34	.0	10%	4	.0	38		.0	48%	.0	23%	.0	0%	.0	29%	.0		.0	.0	
WHITE BIRD	109	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	83%	35	.0	17%	7	.0	42		.0	0%	.0	76%	.0	0%	.0	24%	.0		.0	.0	
IDAHO COUNTY		1.2	1.2	49%	-	.7	30%		.5	22%		2.4		468		.2	10%	1.4	60%	.7	29%	.0	1%	2.4		1.3	.0
COTTONWOOD HD		.6	.1	42%	-	.1	41%		.1	17%		.3		57		.0	2%	.3	84%	.0	12%	.0	2%	.3		.6	.0
DEER CREEK HD		.2	.1	66%	-	.0	30%		.0	4%		.2		42		.0	19%	.1	43%	.0	22%	.0	15%	.1		.2	.0
DOUMECQ HD		.3	.1	42%	-	.0	29%		.0	29%		.1		25		.0	58%	.0	30%	.0	11%	.0	2%	.1		.4	.0
FENN HD		.5	.1	60%	-	.1	31%		.0	9%		.2		49		.0	2%	.2	83%	.0	15%	.0	0%	.3		.4	.0
FERNAND HD		1.0	.2	52%	-	.1	27%		.1	21%		.3		72		.0	2%	.2	56%	.2	42%	.0	0%	.4		.9	.0
GOOD ROADS HD #2		.3	.0	51%	-	.0	32%		.0	17%		.1		18		.0	8%	.0	92%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0		.3	.0
GRANGEVILLE HD		.9	.3	39%	-	.3	42%		.1	19%		.7		118		.1	7%	.6	72%	.1	17%	.0	4%	.8		.8	.0
GREENCREEK HD		.1	.1	58%	-	.1	33%		.0	9%		.2		50		.0	7%	.1	89%	.0	4%	.0	0%	.2		.2	.0
KEUTERVILLE HD		.2	.1	54%	-	.1	31%		.0	15%		.2		47		.0	3%	.1	73%	.0	24%	.0	0%	.2		.3	.0
KIDDER-HARRIS HD		.0	.1	34%	-	.1	24%		.0	42%		.4		55		.1	18%	.3	76%	.0	6%	.0	0%	.4		.0	.0
UNION INDEP. HD		.5	.1	60%	-	.1	31%		.0	9%		.2		52		.0	3%	.3	69%	.1	28%	.0	0%	.4		.4	.0
WHITE BIRD HD		.6	.1	58%	-	.1	34%		.0	8%		.2		53		.2	53%	.1	36%	.0	10%	.0	1%	.3		.5	.0
WINONA HD		.6	.1	53%	-	.0	30%		.0	17%		.1		28		.0	2%	.2	82%	.0	16%	.0	0%	.3		.5	.0
IDAHO COUNTY	14,588	7.4	2.8	45%	194	2.1	32%	141	1.5	23%	100	6.4	436	1,134		.7	10%	4.4	65%	1.4	21%	.2	3%	6.7		1.9	.0
BOVILL	250	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	88%	36	.0	12%	5	.0	41		.0	0%	.0	60%	.0	4%	.0	36%	.0		.0	.0	.0
DEARY	548	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	45%	34	.0	55%	41	.0	75		.0	0%	.0	70%	.0	12%	.0	18%	.0		.0	.0	.0
GENESEE	783	.0	.0	0%	-	.0			.0			.0				.0		.0			.0		.0		.0	.0	.0
JULIETTA	514	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	33%	34	.0	67%	69	.1	103		.0	50%	.0	30%	.0	12%	.0	9%	.1		.0	.0	.0
KENDRICK	351	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	57%	33	.0	43%	25	.0	59		.0	5%	.0	55%	.0	7%	.0	32%	.0		.0	.0	.0
MOSCOW	19,122	1.0	.0	0%	-	1.0	53%	51	.9	47%	46	1.8	97		.0	2%	1.6	74%	.1	5%	.4	19%	2.1		.7	.0	.0
ONAWAY	208	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	57	.0	0%		.0	57		.0	0%	.0	71%	.0	2%	.0	27%	.0		.0	.0	.0
POTLATCH	743	.0	.0	1%	1	.0	35%	44	.1	64%	83	.1	128		.0	0%	.1	77%	.0	13%	.0	10%	.1		.0	.0	.0
TROY	782	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	38%	33	.0	62%	53	.1	86		.0	51%	.0	25%	.0	11%	.0	14%	.1		.0	.0	.0
NORTH LATAH HD		.9	.4	13%	-	1.3	46%		1.1	40%		2.8		605		.0	1%	1.7	67%	.5	20%	.3	12%	2.6		1.0	.0
SOUTH LATAH HD <sup>2</sup>		.3	.1	8%	-	.4	63%		.2	29%		.7		237		.1	6%	.6	69%	.1	16%	.1	9%	.8		.2	.0
LATAH COUNTY	32,276	2.2	.4	8%	13	2.8	50%	87	2.4	42%	73	5.6	173	842		.2	3%	4.0	69%	.8	14%	.8	14%	5.8		2.0	.0
CRAGMONT	571	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	44%	34	.0	56%	43	.0	77		.0	19%	.0	59%	.0	6%	.0	17%	.0		.0	.0	.0
KAMIAH	1,190	.1	.0	0%	-	.0	64%	29	.0	36%	16	.1	45		.0	54%	.0	15%	.0	10%	.0	20%	.1		.0	.0	.0
NEZPERCE	471	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	58%	34	.0	42%	25	.0	60		.0	0%	.0	78%	.0	0%	.0	22%	.0		.0	.0	.0
REUBENS	48	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	54%	25	.0	46%	21	.0	47		.0	16%	.0	35%	.0	15%	.0	34%	.0		.0	.0	.0
WINCHESTER	272	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	36%	35	.0	64%	64	.0	100		.0	11%	.0	53%	.0	18%	.0	18%	.0		.0	.0	.0
CENTRAL HD		.3	.0	0%	-	.2	66%		.1	34%		.3		163		.0	2%	.3	73%	.1	24%	.0	0%	.4		.2	.0
EVERGREEN HD		.0	.0	0%	-	.2	69%		.1	31%		.2		91		.0	4%	.1	79%	.0	16%	.0	2%	.2		.1	.0
KAMIAH HD		.2	.0	0%	-	.1	67%		.1	33%		.2		17		.0	8%	.1	72%	.0	14%	.0	7%	.2		.2	.0

# DISTRICT 3

## IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

## SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION

## LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS

YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

JURISDICTION		Population	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION								FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
				Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
				\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																													
BOISE	126,685																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																				</

# DISTRICT 4

IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

JURISDICTION	Population	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION								FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	
			Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other				
			\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%			
BELLEVUE	1,433	.0	.0	7%	28	.1	13%	51	.4	80%	309	.6	388			.0	5%	.5	88%	.0	2%	.0	5%	.6	.0	.0
HAILEY	4,252	.0	.0		-	.0		-	.0		-	.0	-			.0		.0		.0		.0		.0	.0	.0
KETCHUM	2,685	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	13%	34	.6	87%	234	.7	268			.0	6%	.4	53%	.2	27%	.1	14%	.7	.0	.0
SUN VALLEY	997	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	4%	26	.7	96%	689	.7	715			.0	0%	.3	48%	.0	5%	.3	47%	.7	.0	.0
BLAINE COUNTY		.2	.1	6%		.9	83%		.1	10%		1.1		392		.1	9%	.6	59%	.2	20%	.1	12%	1.1	.3	.0
BLAINE COUNTY	15,990	.3	.1	4%	7	1.1	36%	71	1.9	60%	117	3.1	195	392		.2	5%	1.8	60%	.5	15%	.6	20%	3.0	.3	.0
FAIRFIELD	376	.0	.0	2%	6	.0	35%	89	.1	63%	161	.1	257			.0	12%	.0	10%	.0	7%	.1	71%	.1	.0	.0
CAMAS COUNTY		.4	.0	3%		.4	97%		.0	0%		.4		300		.2	43%	.1	28%	.1	25%	.0	4%	.5	.4	.0
CAMAS COUNTY	793	.5	.0	3%	21	.5	86%	591	.1	11%	77	.5	689	300		.2	38%	.2	26%	.1	22%	.1	14%	.6	.4	.0
ALBION	293	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	95%	37	.0	5%	2	.0	39			.0	0%	.0	100%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	.0	.0
BURLEY	8,918	.0	.0	0%	-	.3	61%	35	.2	39%	23	.5	57			.0	4%	.5	90%	.0	6%	.0	0%	.5	.0	.0
DECLO	289	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	34	.0	0%	-	.0	34			.0	0%	.0	100%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	.0	.0
MALTA	180	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	74%	64	.0	26%	23	.0	87			.0	12%	.0	88%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	.0	.0
OAKLEY	607	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	58%	47	.0	42%	35	.0	82			.0	2%	.0	75%	.0	12%	.0	11%	.1	.0	.0
CASSIA COUNTY		.1	.0	2%		.1	63%		.1	35%		.2		88		.0	27%	.0	18%	.0	12%	.1	43%	.1	.1	.0
ALBION HD		.1	.0	1%		.1	86%		.0	13%		.1		31		.0	46%	.0	44%	.0	9%	.0	0%	.1	.2	.0
BURLEY HD		.6	.0	1%		1.1	58%		.8	41%		1.8		466		.2	14%	1.1	77%	.1	9%	.0	0%	1.5	1.0	.0
MURTAUGH HD <sup>3</sup>		.0	.0	0%		.3	72%		.1	27%		.3		106		.1	17%	.2	66%	.1	17%	.0	0%	.4	.0	.0
OAKLEY HD		.1	.0	2%		.2	62%		.1	36%		.4		248		.0	12%	.3	79%	.0	8%	.0	2%	.4	.1	.0
RAFT RIVER HD		.0	.0	2%		.3	50%		.3	49%		.5		260		.1	24%	.2	33%	.1	25%	.1	18%	.5	.0	.0
CASSIA COUNTY	20,811	.9	.0	1%	2	2.4	60%	114	1.6	39%	75	4.0	191	1,199		.5	15%	2.4	69%	.4	12%	.2	4%	3.5	1.4	.0
BLISS	196	.0	.0	31%	26	.0	57%	47	.0	12%	10	.0	82				0%	.0	32%	.0	49%	.0	19%	.0	.0	.0
GOODING	3,066	.1	.0	0%	-	.2	45%	50	.2	55%	62	.3	113			.1	16%	.2	58%	.0	3%	.1	23%	.3	.1	.0
HAGERMAN	669	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	29%	21	.0	71%	52	.0	73			.0	0%	.0	76%	.0	11%	.0	13%	.0	.0	.0
WENDELL	2,179	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	58%	47	.1	42%	35	.2	82			.1	63%	.0	14%	.0	8%	.0	15%	.2	.1	.0
GOODING COUNTY		.0	.0	0%		.0	100%		.0	0%		.0		22		.0	38%	.0	55%	.0	7%	.0	0%	.0	.0	.0
BLISS HD		.1	.0	10%		.1	81%		.0	9%		.1		82		.0	8%	.0	83%	.0	0%	.0	10%	.0	.2	.0
GOODING HD		1.1	.0	0%		.4	69%		.2	31%		.5		164		.0	1%	.6	81%	.1	14%	.0	3%	.8	.9	.0
HAGERMAN HD		.0	.0	0%		.1	72%		.1	28%		.2		54		.1	58%	.0	32%	.0	6%	.0	3%	.1	.1	.0
WENDELL HD		.3	.0	0%		.3	67%		.1	33%		.4		123		.1	38%	.1	31%	.1	18%	.1	13%	.4	.3	.0
WEST POINT HD		.0	.0	0%		.1	67%		.0	33%		.1		41		.0	36%	.1	44%	.0	13%	.0	8%	.1	.0	.0
GOODING COUNTY	12,678	1.7	.0	1%	1	1.3	64%	101	.7	36%	57	2.0	159	487		.4	22%	1.1	56%	.2	12%	.2	10%	2.0	1.8	.0
EDEN	329	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	61%	34	.0	39%	22	.0	56				0%	.0	100%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	.0	.0
HAZELTON	426	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	82%	33	.0	18%	8	.0	41			.0	24%	.0	29%	.0	13%	.0	34%	.0	.0	.0
JEROME	7,077	.2	.0	0%	-	.3	47%	37	.3	53%	41	.6	79			.1	10%	.4	75%	.0	7%	.0	8%	.6	.2	.0
HILLSDALE HD		.4	.0	0%		.4	64%		.2	36%		.7		257		.2	28%	.3	32%	.3	39%	.0	1%	.8	.3	.0
JEROME HD		.5	.0	0%		.8	58%		.6	42%		1.4		319		.1	10%	1.2	78%	.1	10%	.0	3%	1.5	.4	.0
JEROME COUNTY	16,597	1.2	.0	0%	-	1.5	57%	92	1.1	43%	68	2.6	159	575		.4	15%	1.9	65%	.5	17%	.1	3%	2.9	1.0	.0
DIETRICH	129	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	94%	63	.0	6%	4	.0	68			.0	27%	.0	21%	.0	4%	.0	48%	.0	.0	.0
RICHFIELD	380	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	69%	38	.0	31%	17	.0	55			.0	12%	.0	48%	.0	17%	.0	22%	.0	.0	.0
SHOSHONE	1,273	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	48%	42	.1	52%	46	.1	89			.1	34%	.0	17%	.0	17%	.1	32%	.2	.1	.0
DIETRICH HD		.0	.0	0%		.1	53%		.1	47%		.3		94		.1	20%	.1	24%	.1	40%	.1	17%	.3	.0	.0
KIMAMA HD		.0	.0	0%		.1	70%		.0	30%		.2		81		.0	10%	.0	23%	.0	45%	.0	22%	.1	.1	.0
RICHFIELD HD		.2	.0	0%		.2	81%		.0	19%		.2		110		.0	18%	.1	51%	.1	30%	.0	1%	.2	.2	.0
SHOSHONE HD		.1	.0	0%		.3	69%		.1	31%		.4		118		.2	35%	.1	27%	.1	32%	.0	6%	.4	.1	.0
LINCOLN COUNTY	3,570	.5	.0	0%	-	.8	66%	221	.4	34%	115	1.2	336	403		.3	26%	.4	28%	.4	32%	.2	13%	1.3	.4	.0
ACEQUIA	103	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	63%	33	.0	37%	20	.0	53				0%	.0	59%	.0	0%	.0	41%	.0	.0	.0
HEYBURN	2,836																									

# DISTRICT 5

## IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM      SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION      LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS      YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

JURISDICTION	Population	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION								FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	
			Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other				
			\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%			
ARIMO	314	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	93%	35	.0	7%	3	.0	38			.0	7%	.0	24%	.0	1%	.0	68%	.0	.0	
CHUBBUCK	8,354	.0	.0	0%	-	.3	71%	34	.1	29%	14	.4	47			.0	10%	.2	47%	.1	22%	.1	21%	.4	.0	
DOWNEY	672	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	55%	41	.0	45%	33	.0	74			.0	19%	.0	31%	.0	32%	.0	19%	.1	.0	
INKOM	753	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	55%	36	.0	45%	29	.0	65			.0	0%	.0	50%	.0	19%	.0	31%	.0	.1	
LAVA HOT SPRINGS	464	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	12%	33	.1	88%	238	.1	271			.0	7%	.1	80%	.0	5%	.0	8%	.1	.0	
MCCAMMON	763	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	75%	42	.0	25%	14	.0	55			.0	45%	.0	48%	.0	0%	.0	8%	.0	.0	
POCATELLO	47,914	.1	.0	0%	-	1.6	60%	34	1.1	40%	23	2.7	57			.2	9%	1.7	61%	.4	13%	.5	18%	2.8	.0	
BANNOCK COUNTY		.5	.0	0%	-	1.8	59%		1.3	40%		3.1			.3	11%	1.9	62%	.4	14%	.4	13%	3.0	.6		
DOWNEY-SWAN LAKE HD <sup>5</sup>		.3	.0	1%	-	.4	90%		.0	10%		.5			.1	16%	.3	48%	.2	35%	.0	0%	.6	.2		
BANNOCK COUNTY	70,932	1.0	.0	0%	0	4.3	61%	61	2.7	38%	38	7.0	99	585			.8	11%	4.2	59%	1.1	15%	1.0	14%	7.0	.9
BLOOMINGTON	184	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	24%	37	.0	76%	120	.0	157			.0	20%	.0	74%	.0	0%	.0	6%	.0	.0	
GEORGETOWN	659	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	91%	32	.0	9%	3	.0	35			.0	14%	.0	28%	.0	0%	.0	58%	.0	.0	
MONTPELIER	2,749	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	61%	36	.1	39%	23	.2	59			.0	17%	.0	24%	.1	41%	.0	18%	.2	.0	
PARIS	587	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	41%	35	.0	59%	51	.1	87			.0	0%	.0	29%	.0	55%	.0	16%	.1	.0	
ST CHARLES	205	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	56%	57	.0	44%	45	.0	102			.0	0%	.0	10%	.0	81%	.0	8%	.0	.0	
BEAR LAKE COUNTY		1.1	.0	2%	-	.6	71%		.2	27%		.9		314			.4	43%	.1	11%	.3	35%	.1	12%	.8	1.2
BEAR LAKE COUNTY	6,426	1.1	.0	1%	2	.8	67%	125	.4	31%	59	1.2	186	314			.4	35%	.2	16%	.4	36%	.2	14%	1.1	1.2
ABERDEEN	1,548	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	63%	38	.0	37%	23	.1	61			.0	8%	.1	64%	.0	12%	.0	15%	.1	.0	
ATOMIC CITY	26	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	60%	75	.0	40%	51	.0	126			.0	28%	.0	0%	.0	19%	.0	53%	.0	.0	
BASALT	450	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	88%	35	.0	12%	5	.0	39			.0	4%	.0	48%	.0	35%	.0	13%	.0	.0	
BLACKFOOT	10,628	.1	.0	0%	-	.4	68%	34	.2	32%	16	.5	51			.1	12%	.3	52%	.1	22%	.1	14%	.6	.0	
FIRTH	456	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	38%	34	.0	62%	55	.0	89			.0	20%	.0	71%	.0	3%	.0	6%	.0	.0	
SHELLEY	3,744	.2	.0	0%	-	.1	81%	36	.0	19%	8	.2	44			.0	12%	.1	71%	.0	9%	.0	7%	.2	.2	
BINGHAM COUNTY		1.7	.0	0%	-	2.5	69%		1.1	31%		3.6		1,143			.0	1%	2.6	69%	1.0	26%	.1	3%	3.8	1.5
BINGHAM COUNTY	40,990	2.1	.0	0%	-	3.1	69%	75	1.4	31%	33	4.4	108	1,143			.2	3%	3.2	67%	1.2	25%	.2	5%	4.8	1.7
BANCROFT	417	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	36%	28	.0	64%	49	.0	77			.0	12%	.0	25%	.0	54%	.0	9%	.0	.0	
GRACE	1,121	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	44%	32	.0	56%	41	.1	73			.0	24%	.0	47%	.0	18%	.0	11%	.1	.0	
SODA SPRINGS	3,182	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	68%	37	.1	32%	17	.2	54			.0	15%	.1	61%	.0	17%	.0	7%	.1	.0	
CARIBOU COUNTY		.5	.1	7%	-	1.0	61%		.5	32%		1.6		582			.2	13%	.8	49%	.6	36%	.0	1%	1.6	.6
CARIBOU COUNTY	7,182	.5	.1	6%	16	1.2	61%	164	.6	33%	90	1.9	269	582			.3	14%	.9	50%	.6	35%	.0	2%	1.9	.6
CLIFTON	239	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	77%	31	.0	23%	9	.0	40			.0	0%	.0	64%	.0	0%	.0	36%	.0	.0	
DAYTON	382	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	82%	34	.0	18%	8	.0	41			.0	1%	.0	75%	.0	4%	.0	20%	.0	.0	
FRANKLIN	476	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	51%	36	.0	49%	34	.0	70			.0	0%	.0	59%	.0	19%	.0	22%	.0	.0	
PRESTON	3,807	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	49%	35	.1	51%	36	.3	71			.0	3%	.2	62%	.1	23%	.0	13%	.3	.1	
WESTON	426	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	79%	24	.0	21%	6	.0	30			.0	2%	.0	70%	.0	1%	.0	28%	.0	.0	
FRANKLIN COUNTY		.3	.0	1%	-	.7	79%		.2	19%		.8		311			.2	29%	.4	49%	.1	9%	.1	13%	.8	.3
FRANKLIN COUNTY	10,070	.4	.0	1%	1	.8	72%	84	.3	27%	32	1.2	117	311			.2	22%	.6	53%	.1	12%	.2	14%	1.2	.4
MALAD	2,058	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	48%	38	.1	52%	41	.2	79			.0	6%	.0	28%	.0	23%	.1	42%	.2	.0	
ONEIDA COUNTY		.2	.0	2%	-	.7	88%		.1	11%		.8		416			.3	33%	.4	47%	.1	18%	.0	3%	.8	.2
ONEIDA COUNTY	3,657	.2	.0	1%	3	.8	81%	211	.2	18%	46	1.0	261	416			.3	28%	.4	44%	.2	19%	.1	9%	1.0	.2
AMERICAN FALLS	4,008	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	51%	37	.1	49%	36	.3	73			.0	8%	.2	50%	.1	25%	.1	17%	.3	.0	
ROCKLAND	305	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	80%	32	.0	20%	8	.0	40			.0	0%	.0	19%	.0	0%	.0	81%	.0	.0	
POWER CO HD		.5	.0	0%	-	1.1	47%		1.2	52%		2.3		610			.6	25%	1.3	53%	.5	22%	.0	0%	2.4	.4
POWER COUNTY	7,891	.5	.0	0%	0	1.3	48%	160	1.4	52%	173	2.6	334	610			.6	23%	1.4	53%	.6	22%	.1	2%	2.7	.5
CITIES (29)	96,891	.7	.0	0%	-	3.4	60%	35	2.3	40%	24	5.7	58	0			.6	10%	3.2	56%	1.0	17%	1.0	17%	5.7	.7
COUNTIES (6)	-	4.4	.2	2%	-	7.3	67%		3.4	31%		10.9		3,196			1.4	13%	6.2	57%	2.5	23%	.8	7%	10.9	4.4
HIGHWAY DISTRICTS (2)	-	.7	.0	0%	-	1.5	54%		1.3	45%		2.8		765			.7	23%	1.5	52%	.7	24%	.0	0%	3.0	.6
DISTRICT 5 TOTAL (37)	147,148	5.9	.2	1%	1	12.2	63%	83	6.9	36%	47	19.3	131	3,961			2.7	14%	10.9	56%	4.2	22%	1.8	9%	19.6	5.6

<sup>3</sup> Includes 93 miles located in Twin Falls County.

<sup>4</sup> Includes 12 miles located in Cassia County.

<sup>5</sup> Includes 7 miles located in Franklin County.



# DISTRICT 6

## IDAHO'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

## SUMMARY FINANCIAL INFORMATION

## LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994

REVENUE SOURCE												LOCAL ROAD AND STREET JURISDICTIONS												YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1994											
JURISDICTION	Population	Beginning Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions	REVENUE SOURCE									FY 1994 Total Revenues \$ Amt. Millions	Revenues /capita	Improved Road Miles (IRM)	FTE Employees	EXPENDITURES BY CLASSIFICATION												FY 1994 Total Expenditures \$ Amt. Millions	Closing Fund Balance \$ Amt. Millions						
			Federal Funds			State Funds			Local Funds							Administration		Construction and Maintenance		Equipment		Other													
			\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita	\$ Amt. Millions	%	Per Capita					\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%	\$ Amt. Millions	%												
AMMON	5,469	.4	.0	0%	-	.2	94%	34	.0	6%	2	.2	36			.0	20%	.1	57%	.0	9%	.0	14%	.2	4%	.4		.4							
IDAHO FALLS	48,226	1.1	.0	0%	-	2.6	48%	53	2.7	52%	56	5.3	109			.5	10%	3.5	71%	.7	15%	.2	4%	4.9		1.5									
IONA	1,107	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	95%	34	.0	5%	2	.0	36			.0	14%	.0	62%	.0	15%	.0	9%	.0		.0									
IRWIN	116	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	99%	25	.0	1%	0	.0	25			.0	0%	.0	100%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0		.0									
SWAN VALLEY	139	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	98%	36	.0	2%	1	.0	36			.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0		.0									
UCON	932	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	98%	37	.0	2%	1	.0	38			.0	5%	.0	21%	.0	31%	.0	42%	.0		.0									
BONNEVILLE COUNTY	79,213	2.7	.1	2%	1	5.5	66%	70	2.8	34%	36	8.4	106	818		.7	19%	2.2	58%	.8	22%	.0	1%	3.7		.0									
BONNEVILLE COUNTY			.1	1%										818		1.2	14%	5.8	65%	1.6	18%	.3	3%	8.8		2.2									
ARCO	1,029	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	60%	40	.0	40%	27	.1	66			.0	23%	.0	5%	.0	18%	.0	54%	.1		.0									
BUTTE CITY	65	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	99%	53	.0	1%	1	.0	53			.0	88%	.0	1%	.0	0%	.0	11%	.0		.0									
MOORE	196	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	70	.0	0%	-	.0	70			.0	34%	.0	4%	.0	0%	.0	62%	.0		.0									
BUTTE COUNTY	3,044	.2	.0	2%	4	.6	77%	204	.2	22%	61	.7	326	326		.0	5%	.4	57%	.2	34%	.0	5%	.7		.2									
DUBOIS	480	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	40%	31	.0	60%	48	.0	79			.1	7%	.4	52%	.2	32%	.1	9%	.7		.3									
CLARK COUNTY	814	.8	.0	4%	25	.5	93%	604	.0	3%	49	.5	309	309		.0	0%	.0	9%	.0	71%	.0	20%	.0		.0									
CHALLIS	995	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	25%	38	.1	75%	111	.1	678			.0	0%	.3	56%	.2	43%	.0	0%	.5		.9									
MACKAY	592	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	82%	42	.0	18%	9	.0	149			.0	0%	.3	53%	.2	45%	.0	2%	.5		.9									
STANLEY	70	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	17%	36	.0	83%	177	.0	51			.0	10%	.1	52%	.0	21%	.0	18%	.1		.1									
CUSTER COUNTY	3,984	.4	.1	14%	-	.5	83%	36	.0	3%	177	.5	213			.0	5%	.0	69%	.0	14%	.0	13%	.0		.0									
LOST RIVER HD			.1	19%		.3	67%		.1	14%		.5		223		.0	0%	.0	90%	.0	0%	.0	10%	.0		.0									
CUSTER COUNTY			.2	13%	41	.8	69%	208	.2	17%	52	1.2	301	500		.1	8%	.3	74%	.1	18%	.0	0%	.4		.5									
ASHTON	1,104	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	69%	37	.0	31%	17	.0	53			.1	24%	.2	54%	.1	21%	.0	1%	.4		.1									
NEWDALE	361	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	86%	33	.0	14%	5	.0	38			.1	15%	.6	63%	.2	19%	.0	3%	.9		.7									
PARKER	314	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	87%	32	.0	13%	5	.0	37			.0	0%	.0	21%	.0	50%	.0	5%	.0		.0									
ST ANTHONY	3,393	.0	.0	0%	-	.1	85%	36	.0	15%	6	.0	42			.0	24%	.0	56%	.0	33%	.0	11%	.0		.0									
TETON	563	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	85%	36	.0	15%	6	.0	42			.1	43%	.0	19%	.0	12%	.0	27%	.1		.0									
FREMONT COUNTY	11,525	1.5	.0	2%	3	.9	59%	92	.6	39%	55	1.5	513	513		.0	17%	.0	64%	.0	7%	.0	13%	.0		.0									
FREMONT COUNTY			.0	2%		1.1	61%		.6	37%		1.7	149	513		.6	39%	.7	43%	.2	14%	.1	4%	1.6		1.4									
LEWISVILLE	549	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	55%	57	.0	45%	47	.1	104			.7	39%	.7	41%	.2	14%	.1	6%	1.8		1.4									
MENAN	768	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	82%	29	.0	18%	7	.0	36			.0	0%	.0	69%	.0	0%	.0	31%	.1		.0									
MUD LAKE	182	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	62%	34	.0	38%	21	.2	55			.0	18%	.0	0%	.0	49%	.0	33%	.0		.0									
RIGBY	2,950	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	42%	33	.1	58%	45	.1	78			.0	0%	.1	84%	.0	13%	.0	3%	.1		.0									
RIRIE	665	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	53%	32	.0	47%	28	.0	60			.0	0%	.0	22%	.0	3%	.0	21%	.0		.0									
ROBERTS	647	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	90%	32	.1	10%	15	1.3	88			.0	53%	.0	66%	.0	20%	.0	14%	.0		.0									
JEFFERSON COUNTY	18,427	.6	.0	0%	0	1.2	83%	74	.3	17%	15	1.6	653	653		.2	17%	.8	55%	.4	28%	.0	0%	1.4		.4									
JEFFERSON COUNTY			.0	0%		1.4	83%		.3	17%			88	653		.3	15%	1.0	56%	.4	26%	.0	3%	1.7		.5									
LEADORE	85	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	32	.0	0%	-	.0	32			.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	0%	.0	100%	.0		.0									
SALMON	3,093	.1	.0	0%	-	.1	43%	34	.1	57%	45	.2	79			.1	23%	.2	57%	.0	15%	.0	5%	.3		.0									
LEMHI COUNTY	7,425	1.2	.1	17%	19	.7	80%	103	.2	3%	22	1.1	144	325		.5	57%	.2	17%	.2	26%	.0	0%	.9		1.0									
LEMHI COUNTY			.1	13%		.8	71%		.2	15%			144	325		.6	48%	.3	27%	.3	23%	.0	2%	1.2		1.0									
REXBURG	14,497	.1	.0	0%	-	.5	73%	35	.2	27%	13	.7	48			.0	8%	.4	59%	.2	26%	.0	7%	.6		.1									
SUGAR CITY	1,410	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	82%	33	.0	18%	7	.1	40			.0	0%	.0	43%	.0	46%	.0	11%	.0		.0									
MADISON COUNTY	23,743	.5	.0	0%	0	1.5	58%	64	.7	42%	38	1.7	405	405		.3	16%	.9	55%	.3	20%	.2	10%	1.6		.4									
MADISON COUNTY			.0	0%		1.5	63%		.9	37%		2.4	102	405		.3	14%	1.3	56%	.5	22%	.2	9%	2.3		.6									
DRIGGS	980	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	100%	32	.0	0%	-	.0	32			.0	19%	.0	8%	.0	49%	.0	24%	.0		.0									
TETONIA	153	.0	.0	0%	-	.0	49%	32	.0	51%	33	.0	65			.0	3%	.0	9%	.0	66%	.0	23%	.0		.0									
VICTOR	341	.0	.0																																

**Legislative Committee Members**

**Senator Evan Frasure-Cochair  
Senator Jerry Twiggs  
Senator Hal Bunderson  
Senator Judi Danielson  
Senator Bruce Sweeney  
Senator Lin Whitworth**

**Representative JoAn Wood-Cochair  
Representative Hilde Kellogg  
Representative Dave Bivens  
Representative Jim Kempton  
Representative Marvin Vandenberg  
Representative Charles Cuddy**

**Designated Nonlegislative Committee Members**

**(See committee minutes for other representatives in attendance)**

**Idaho Transportation Department . . . . Director Dwight Bower  
Idaho Association of Counties. . . . . Executive Director Dan Chadwick  
Association of Idaho Cities . . . . . Executive Director Scott McDonald  
Idaho Association of Highway  
Districts. . . . . Executive Director Ray Oliver**

**January 1996  
House Concurrent Resolution No. 21, 1995**